

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03028 01 OF 02 042306Z

70

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20

USIA-15 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 AEC-11 IO-14 OIC-04

OMB-01 DRC-01 /161 W

----- 090467

P R 041851Z APR 74

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2333

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 VIENNA 3028

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

E. O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: AD HOC GROUP

MEETING OF 29 MARCH 1974

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: AHG MEETING OF MARCH 29, 1974 WAS  
DEVOTED TO CLARIFICATION OF A NUMBER OF OPEN  
POINTS. THE GROUP REVIEWED SEVERAL BILATERAL CONTACTS  
WITH THE EAST IN ORDER TO ADDRESS THE QUESTION OF  
WHETHER THE EAST WAS INDICATING THAT A COMMON  
CEILING ON ALL (I.E. GROUND AND AIR FORCES IN  
THE REDUCTIONS AREA) WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE, AND CON-  
CLUDED THAT THE EAST IS INSTEAD ARGUING THAT,  
WITH AIR FORCES TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT, PARITY ALREADY  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03028 01 OF 02 042306Z

EXISTS. THE GROUP REVIEWED THE DRAFT TALKING POINTS

FOR USE IN THE APRIL 1 INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPS, AND MADE A VARIETY OF MINOR DRAFTING CHANGES. THE MAIN THEME OF THESE TALKING POINTS WAS THAT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD PUT OTHER ASPECTS OF REDUCTIONS ASIDE AND FIRST SETTLE THE QUESTION OF WHOSE FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCED FIRST.

GROUP ALSO DISCUSSED THE MARCH 28 PLENARY STATEMENT BY THE GDR, AND APPROVED A DRAFT OUTLINE FOR THE ALLIED PLENARY STATEMENT SCHEDULE FOR APRIL 4 ON THE COMMON CEILING. THE AHG MILITARY DATA SUBGROUP ALSO MADE A GRIEF/REPORT ON THE DIFFICULTIES OF CATEGORIZING SSM, HELICOPTER, AND AIR DEFENSE FORCES, WHICH CONCLUDED THAT A NATO STUDY OF THE SUBJECT WAS PROBABLY NEEDED. END SUMMARY

2. DISCUSSION AND CLARIFICATION OF PREVIOUS BILATERAL CONTACTS WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES

THE US DEP REP ASKED FOR CLARIFICATION ON THE QUESTION OF THE EASTERN PERCEPTION OF PARITY IN A COMMON CEILING CONCEPT, AS REPORTED BY THE UK DEP REP (GOODALL) IN HIS BILATERAL CONTACT WITH THE POLISH REPS ON 22 MARCH AND THE BILATERAL CONTACT BY THE ITALIAN REP (CAGIATI) WITH THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE GDR. THE US DEP REP ASKED IF THE EASTERN REPS HAD IN FACT STATED THAT THE EAST WAS ASKING FOR AN OVERALL COMMON CEILING ON ALL FORCES IN THE NATO GUIDELINES AREAS.

3. THE UK DEP REP (GOODALL) REVIEWED FOR THE AHG HIS DISCUSSION WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SOVIET DELEGATION ON MARCH 20TH AND NOTED THAT THE SOVIETS HAD STRESSED THE INEQUITY OF THE WESTERN PROPOSAL OF A COMMON CEILING LIMITED TO GROUND FORCES. THE UK DEP REP HAD ASKED THE SOVIET REP IF A COMMON CEILING ON ALL FORCES (I.E., GROUND AND AIR FORCES) WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO THE EAST. THE SOVIET REP HAD RESPONDED CURTLY THAT THIS WAS NOT THE POINT THEY WERE ATTEMPTING TO MAKE; RATHER, THE SOVIET VIEW WAS THAT THE NATO COMMON CEILING PROPOSAL MADE NO SENSE UNLESS IT APPLIED TO ALL FORCES IN THE RE-  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03028 01 OF 02 042306Z

DUCTIONS AREA. THE UK DEP REP HAD THEN DECIDED TO PUT THIS SAME QUESTION REGARDING THE ACCEPTABILITY TO THE EAST OF A COMMON CEILING ON ALL FORCES IN THE REDUCTION AREA TO POLISH REPS IN A DISCUSSION ON 22 MARCH. THE POLISH REPS HAD READILY ACCEPTED THIS CONCEPT. THE US DEP REP ASKED THE UK DEP REP IF IT WAS HIS INTERPRETATION THAT IN FACT THE EASTERN POSITION WAS THAT A COMMON CEILING ON ALL FORCE ELEMENTS,

EITHER COLLECTIVELY OR INDIVIDUALLY, WAS DESIRABLE. THE UK DEP REP REPLIED THAT THIS PROBABLY WAS NOT THE CASE. THE EAST RATHER WAS ARGUING THAT OVERALL PARITY ALREADY EXISTED AND THAT IN THIS SENSE A COMMON CEILING WAS UNNECESSARY.

4. THE CANADIAN REP (GRANDE) ADDED THAT IN RECENT DISCUSSION WITH HIM AND ITALIAN AMBASSADOR, THE GDR REP (OESER) HAD CONFIRMED THAT THE EASTERN VIEW IS THAT OVERALL MILITARY PARITY IN THE REDUCTIONS ARE EXISTS NOW, AND THEREFORE THE EASTERN CONCEPT OF A "COMMON CEILING" ALREADY EXISTS. ON THIS BASIS, THE AHG CONCLUDED THAT THE EAST HAD NOT IN FACT MODIFIED ITS POSITION SO AS TO BE WILLING TO ACCEPT A COMMON CEILING ON ALL FORCES IN THE REDUCTIONS AREA.

5. DISCUSSION OF GDR PLENARY STATEMENT OF 28 MARCH 1974

THE UK DEP REP NOTED THE HEAVY EMPHASIS BY THE GDR REP ON THE NEED TO INCLUDE NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN MBFR. THE UK DEP REP FURTHER NOTED THAT THE SOVIET REPS HAVE NOT PLACED SIMILAR STRESS ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS RECENTLY. HE WONDERED WHETHER THIS MIGHT INDICATE THAT NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND THEIR REDUCTION MIGHT BE MORE IMPORTANT TO THE EAST EUROPEANS THAN TO THE SOVIETS.

6. THE FRG DEP REP (HOFFMAN) COMMENTED THAT THE FRG DELEGATION BELIEVED THAT THE EAST WAS IN FACT BRINGING IN POINTS FROM THE INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS IN PLENARY STATEMENTS JUST AS THE WEST WAS DOING. IT APPEARED THAT THE GDR HAD BEEN DESIGNATED BY THE EAST TO COMMENT UPON NUCLEAR ISSUES IN PLENARY STATEMENTS, WHILE

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 VIENNA 03028 01 OF 02 042306Z

THE CZECH REP APPARENTLY HAD BEEN DESIGNATED TO COMMENT ON ISSUES RELATED TO AIR FORCES. THE FRG DEP REP FURTHER NOTED THAT THE GDR REPRESENTATIVE CONTINUED TO REVEAL HIMSELF AS THE MOST IDEOLOGICALLY ORIENTED DELEGATION IN THE EASTERN GROUP. THIS LAST POINT COULD ACCOUNT FOR THE RELATIVELY HARD LINE TAKEN IN THE GDR PLENARY STATEMENT.

7. THE ITALIAN DEP REP (TALIANI) COMMENTED THAT HE FELT THERE WERE SOME HINTS IN THE GDR PLENARY STATEMENT THAT A FREEZE ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS MIGHT BE ACCEPTABLE TO THE EAST IN LIEU OF INITIAL REDUCTIONS. HE ALSO NOTED THAT THE GDR PLENARY STATEMENT CONTAINED THE FIRST EASTERN MENTION OF EUROPEAN NUCLEAR DELIVERY CAPABILITY.

8. REVIEW OF TALKING POINTS FOR INFORMAL DISCUSSION  
WITH THE EAST ON 1 APRIL 1974

THE TALKING POINTS TO BE USED WITH THE EAST IN THE  
INFORMAL DISCUSSION ON 1 APRIL CONSISTED OF TWO PARTS.  
THE FIRST PROPOSED THAT IN THE FUTURE, PARTICIPANTS  
ISOLATE THE QUESTION OF WHOSE FORCES SHOULD BE  
REDUCED FIRST AND GIVE PRIORITY TO ITS SOLUTION.  
THE SECOND, WHICH THE GROUP  
ACCEPTED WITH ONLY MINOR EDITORIAL CHANGES, RECAP-  
ITULATED PREVIOUSLY USED ALLIED TALKING POINTS  
EXPRESSING WESTERN OBJECTIONS TO THE EASTERN PROPOSAL

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03028 02 OF 02 042007Z

70  
ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20

USIA-15 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 AEC-11 IO-14 OIC-04

OMB-01 DRC-01 /161 W  
----- 087714

P R 041851Z APR 74  
FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2334  
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
INFO USMISSION NATO  
AMEMBASSY BONN  
AMEMBASSY LONDON  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

CONFIDENTIAL SECTION 2 OF 2 VIENNA 3028

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

ON SYMBOLIC REDUCTIONS.

9. THE US REP NOTED THAT THE FORTHCOMING INFORMAL SESSION WOULD PROBABLY BE THE LAST WITH THE EAST BEFORE THE EASTER RECESS, SO THAT THE WEST SHOULD LEAVE A DEFINITIVE MESSAGE WITH THE EAST IN THIS FINAL SESSION, THAT IS THAT REDUCTIONS OF WEST EUROPEAN FORCES SHOULD BE DEFERRED UNTIL PHASE II. THE UK DEP REP STATED THAT IN HIS OPINION THE FORMULATION OF THE SUGGESTED TALKING POINTS BETWEEN EAST AND WEST COULD BE READ TO IMPLY A CHANGE IN THE ALLIED POSITION ON FIRST PHASE REDUCTIONS: THAT US AND SOVIET FORCES WOULD BE REDUCED BUT THE QUESTION OF WHAT TYPES OF US FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCED WAS NOW NEGOTIABLE. THE US REP STRESSED THAT THIS IMPLICATION HAD NOT BEEN INTENDED IN THE FORMULATION OF THE TALKING POINTS, AND AFTER DISCUSSION, CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03028 02 OF 02 042007Z

THE TEXT WAS CLARIFIED TO MEET UK CONCERNS ON THIS MATTER.

10. THE GREEK REP (DOUNTAS) SUGGESTED A CHANGE TO THE TEXT TO INDICATE THAT ONLY SOME OF THE MAIN POINTS OF COMMON GROUND PERCEIVED BY THE WEST WERE BEING DISCUSSED AT THIS INFORMAL SESSION, (I.E., THE FLANK ISSUE WAS NOT TREATED). THIS MODIFICATION WAS AGREED. THE CANADIAN REP RECOMMENDED A MINOR CHANGE TO THE TEXT TO STRESS THAT GROUND FORCE REDUCTIONS REDUCED THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR. THE BELGIAN REP INTERJECTED THAT EXCESSIVE STRESS ON THE DANGER OF NUCLEAR WAR IN THE TALKING POINTS COULD SUBMERGE THE IMPORTANCE OF REDUCING THE GROUND FORCE ASYMMETRY IN MBFR. THE CANADIAN REP AGREED WITH THIS POINT BUT ADDED THAT THE TEXT SHOULD BE SPECIFIC IN STATING THAT THE COMMON CEILING DESIRED BY THE WEST WAS TO BE APPLIED TO GROUND FORCES. THE US REP NOTED THAT, IN THIS SPECIFIC SEGMENT OF THE TALKING POINTS, THE EASTERN PROPOSAL WAS BEING DISCUSSED, WHICH DEALT WITH REDUCTIONS WITH ALL FORCES IN THE REDUCTION AREA. CANADIAN REP ACCEPTED THIS POINT.

11. CANADIAN REP NOTED THAT THE TEXT SEEMED TO IMPLY THAT THE SOVIET REPS HAD AGREED ON THE NEED TO ALLOW EXCEPTIONS TO FORCE CEILINGS FOR PURPOSES OF EXERCISES AFTER PHASE I REDUCTIONS. US REP NOTED THAT, IN THIS CASE, DISCUSSION OF EXERCISES WAS BEING CONDUCTED IN THE CONTEXT IN WHICH IT HAD BEEN SUBSUMED IN DISCUSSIONS WITH THE SOVIETS, WHICH LINKED SUCH EXCEPTIONS TO THOSE REQUIRED FOR REPLACEMENTS OR ROTATIONS. HE ADDED THAT THE ULTIMATE INTENT OF THIS PART OF THE TALKING POINTS WAS TO MAKE THE SOVIETS THE DEMANDEUR ON THE NEED FOR EXCEPTIONS TO RESIDUAL FORCE CEILINGS FOR SEMI-ANNUAL SOVIET TROOP ROTATIONS. THE AHG ACCEPTED THIS EXPLANATION.

12. THE UK DEP REP RECOMMENDED A CHANGE TO THE TEXT INDICATING THAT OBJECTIONS TO THE EASTERN SYMBOLIC REDUCTION PROPOSAL CONTAINED IN THE TEXT WERE THE MAIN ALLIED OBJECTIONS BUT WERE NOT ALL-INCLUSIVE. THIS CHANGE WAS AGREED. THE FRG REP RECOMMENDED THAT

A PORTION OF THE TEXT OF THE TALKING POINTS BE DELETED WHICH  
COULD BE READ TO IMPLY THAT THE WEST MIGHT BE WILLING TO ACCEPT  
A SEQUENTIAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE KEY POINTS IN ITS FIRST  
PHASE REDUCTION, IN ORDER TO GAIN EASTERN ACCEPTANCE OF THE OVERALL  
ALLIED PROPOSAL. THIS WAS AGREED.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03028 02 OF 02 042007Z

13. CANADIAN REP RECOMMENDED A MINOR CHANGE TO THE TEXT OF THE TALKING POINTS TO CLARIFY THAT THE FIXED PERIOD OF TIME BEFORE NEGOTIATIONS ON PHASE II OF THE ALLIED REDUCTION PROPOSAL WERE TO BEGIN WOULD BE AGREED IN PHASE I OF THE ALLIED PROPOSAL. THIS CHANGE WAS ACCEPTED. THE FRG REP RECOMMENDED DELETION OF A PORTION OF THE TEXT REFERRING TO POSSIBLE ELEMENTS OF A PHASE II AGREEMENT. THIS DELETION WAS ACCEPTED. UK REP RECOMMENDED A MODIFICATION TO THE TEXT STRESSING THAT SUCCESSFUL COMPLETEION OF PHASE I OF THE ALLIED PROPOSAL WAS ONLY A STEP TOWARDS THE ULTIMATE GOAL OF MBFR ACHIEVEMENT OF A COMMON CEILING. THIS CHANGE WAS ACCEPTED. PAPER AS APPROVED WAS USED BY U.S. REP IN INFORMAL SESSION.

14. THE CHAIRMAN OF THE DATA SUB-GROUP (STEIFF) STATED THAT A MEETING OF THE DATA SUB-GROUP HAD BEEN HELD ON 29 MARCH, AND THAT THERE HAD BEEN GENERAL AGREEMENT THAT A NATO STUDY WAS PROBABLY NEEDED OF FORCE TABULATION METHODOLOGY FOR VARIOUS TYPES OF SSM, HELICOPTER AND GROUND AIR DEFENSE FORCES. HE ADDED THAT THERE HAD ALSO BEEN GENERAL AGREEMENT IN THE DATA SUB-GROUP THAT THE QUESTION OF INCLUDING CIVILIAN MANPOWER IN MBFR AS POSED BY THE EAST WAS A DIVERSIONARY TACTIC AND SHOULD BE REJECTED IF SURFACED AGAIN AS IRRELEVANT AND NOT AN AGREED SUBJECT FOR NEGOTIATIONS. HE NOTED THAT THE US REPS HAD CIRCULATED A PAPER GIVING US VIEWS ON FORCE TABULATION METHODOLOGY, WHICH WOULD BE CONSIDERED BY THE OTHER REPRESENTATIVES. HE ALSO ANNOUNCED THAT MAJOR GENERAL CRITTENBERGER HAD BEEN SELECTED AS THE NEW CHAIRMAN OF THE MILITARY DATA SUB-GROUP.

15. THE NEXT MEETING OF THE AHG WAS SET FOR 10:30 A.M. ON APRIL 2.  
HUMES

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptoning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** ARMED FORCES, NEGOTIATIONS, MEETING PROCEEDINGS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 04 APR 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974VIENNA03028  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D740076-0522  
**From:** VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740466/aaaacirj.tel  
**Line Count:** 319  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 6  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 19 MAR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <19 MAR 2002 by collinp0>; APPROVED <06 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: AD HOC GROUP MEETING OF 29 MARCH 1974  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO, MBFR  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005